

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA  
BOARD OF EDUCATION  
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

**MINUTES**

January 14, 2010

The Board of Education and the Board of Career and Technical Education met at the James Monroe State Office Building, Jefferson Conference Room, 22<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Richmond, with the following members present:

Dr. Mark E. Emblidge, President  
Dr. Ella P. Ward, Vice President  
Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr.  
Mrs. Isis M. Castro

Mr. David L. Johnson  
Mr. K. Rob Krupicka  
Dr. Virginia L. McLaughlin  
Mrs. Eleanor B. Saslaw

Dr. Patricia I. Wright, Superintendent of  
Public Instruction

Dr. Emblidge, president, presided and called the meeting to order at 9 a.m.

***MOMENT OF SILENCE/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE***

Dr. Emblidge led in a moment of silence and Pledge of Allegiance.

***APPROVAL OF MINUTES***

Dr. Ward made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 17, 2009, meeting of the Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously. Copies of the minutes had been distributed to all members of the Board of Education.

***NEW BOARD MEMBER***

Dr. Emblidge welcomed the Board's newest member, Dr. Billy K. Cannaday, Jr. Dr. Cannaday was appointed to serve an unexpired term beginning January 5, 2010, and ending June 30, 2011, to succeed Kelvin Moore.

***RESOLUTIONS/RECOGNITIONS***

- A Resolution of Appreciation was presented to Dr. Mark E. Emblidge. The resolution reads as follows:

Board of Education  
Resolution of Appreciation  
Dr. Mark E. Emblidge  
Member of the Virginia Board of Education, 2002-2010  
Board President, 2006-2010

*Whereas*, it is with profound respect for his professional and personal accomplishments that the members of the Board of Education thank Dr. Mark E. Emblidge for his distinguished service as a member and president of this body; and

*Whereas*, with the understanding and wisdom that come from his experience in bringing communities together for the common good, Dr. Emblidge has championed academic programs that are sure to touch the lives of students for many years to come, and Virginia's public schools are better in innumerable ways because of his tenacious and steadfast leadership; and

*Whereas*, because his legacy of service has led to vastly improved Standards of Quality, Standards of Accreditation, academic standards, programs for preschool children, and teacher licensure standards, Dr. Emblidge has earned respect and admiration for his public service and, thereby, has set the example of leadership for programs and initiatives that have been and will remain of vital importance to public education in the Commonwealth;

*Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved* that the members of the Board of Education express their gratitude to Mark E. Emblidge for his excellent leadership, for his integrity, and for the professional manner in which he has performed his duties as president;

*Be It Further Resolved* that the members of the Board of Education extend their warmest best wishes to Dr. Emblidge for his continued good work in future endeavors filled with new challenges and new adventures.

Presented in Richmond, Virginia, This Fourteenth Day of January in the Year 2010.  
(Signed by the vice-president of the Board and Dr. Wright.)

Board members praised Dr. Emblidge for his service to Virginia's students.  
Following are their comments:

Dr. Cannaday - "I appreciate your leadership from two perspectives: first, watching you as a practicing superintendent in a local school division, and second, as state superintendent of public instruction. On both occasions I always found you to be a person that had the best interest of children. You were always able to blend and take different points of view and find a common ground to make good decisions that were the best interest for all. I appreciate your leadership and willingness to be open-minded to everyone who has an idea on how to make things better. You are a model for all to follow. I am glad to have known you personally and professionally. We are proud of your leadership with the Board and public education for so many years."

Dr. McLaughlin - "I will echo my colleague's words. For most of your tenure I have watched you from afar and appreciate your leadership for the development of policy and advocacy with the Governor's office and the General Assembly. I am most appreciative of your openness to mentoring rookie members of the Board and the ways you built this board to be a very functioning team. You have encouraged diverse perspectives and rigorous debate and shaped a group that has the best interest of the commonwealth, you struggled to formulate the policy that will work well for all. Thanks for your leadership."

Mr. Krupicka – “I feel like I owe Mark an enormous state of gratitude because I don’t think I would be on this Board if it were not for Mark. He and I worked with Governor Kaine on preschool efforts and we got to know each other. I know that he helped encourage me to consider the Board as something I could do, and he put in a good word for me. I greatly appreciate that. I see Mark as a friend and mentor and someone who has led a life so far that I would like to emulate in many ways. It has been a huge honor to serve with him and I look forward to many great things in the future.”

Mr. Johnson – “I think Mark has set the bar very high for people who will follow him in this position because of the time, effort, and the energy he has put into this. This has been far and above what we usually see. Your interest in and love for education comes across in everything that you do and it has not just been while you were on the Board. It has been your life’s work and for that we on the Board appreciate everything you have done. I know that the children in this commonwealth are better served today because you gave the time, effort, and energy to this job. We thank you.”

Mrs. Saslaw – “When Mark first became president he set up a communication process between the Board members, the president, and the staff that has served us well during his entire tenure. This communication process allowed Board members to offer their expertise in certain areas that were of personal interest and background. One particular case is when Mrs. Castro alerted him to the NASBE grant to expand pre-K. He pursued that grant, and with the Board’s participation in the entire pre-K process we were able to support and encourage certain initiatives that the Board was concerned about in terms of the expanding pre-K programs. Mark is an absolute educator with children always in mind. I congratulate you on a wonderful tenure.”

Mrs. Castro – “I want to thank you publicly for being a friend, for taking time to meet me before I became a member of the Board and updating me on Board matters, and being the person you started to be when you first got elected president. It was under your presidency that I was able to share and to convey what I felt was necessary for our students, and I was heard. I know that in your previous life your heart was in education, it has been in education here, and it will continue to be in education when you leave us. Don’t forget us, and thank you very much.”

Dr. Ward – “We go back seven years and it has been a great experience working with you. You are truly an advocate for education. I know that whatever you do will always be about the love for children. You have the leadership, tenacity, the integrity, honesty and love for children. Don’t forget us, and thank you for a job well done.”

Dr. Wright – “On behalf of the entire DOE staff, thank you for your leadership and support. I have had the pleasure of working directly with you for eight years as a Board member and Board president. It is amazing to look back over the past eight years and think about all the policies and initiatives you have spearheaded. It has been a pleasure.”

Dr. Emblidge thanked the Board for trusting him to be their leader. He also thanked Governors Warner and Kaine for the extraordinary honor of serving on the state Board.

- A Resolution was presented in the Memory of Dr. S. John Davis, Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Commonwealth of Virginia, 1978-1990. Dr. Davis died on November 22, 2009 in Roanoke. In an education career spanning five decades, Dr. Davis oversaw the Fairfax County Public Schools, the largest school system in Virginia for nearly 10 years before he was appointed in 1979 to the state’s top education job by Governor Dalton. As state superintendent, Dr. Davis helped implement some of the state’s first magnet schools and summer academies for gifted children. The first steps in the direction of what is known now as the Standards of Learning were taken under the leadership of Dr. Davis. After he

stepped down as state superintendent in early 1990, he started an education consulting business.

- A Resolution in Honor of Virginia's 2010 Teacher of the Year was presented to Catherine S. Webb, Speech Language Pathologist and Special Education Teacher, Narrows Elementary School in Giles County. The Board also presented Mrs. Webb with the state flag to fly at her school in honor of all teachers in Virginia.

### ***PUBLIC COMMENT***

The following persons spoke during public comment:

The Honorable Dr. Mark Christie  
Steve King  
Rena Berlin  
Ronnie Cohen  
James Batterson  
Dr. Phil Worrell  
Amy Woolard  
Sarah Geddes  
Juanita Matkins

### ***CONSENT AGENDA***

Mr. Krupicka made a motion to approve the consent agenda. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

- Final Review of Financial Report on Literary Fund
- Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Applications for Literary Fund Loans
- Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Literary Fund Applications Approved for Release of Fund or Placement on a Waiting List.
- First Review of the Board of Education's 2009 Annual Report on Electronic Meetings
- First Review of Revisions of Industry, Professional, or Trade Association Certification Examinations and Occupational Competency Assessments to Meet the Requirements for the Board of Education's Career and Technical Education and Advanced Mathematics and Technology Seals and the Student-Selected Verified Credit

### ***Final Review of Financial Report on Literary Fund***

The Board approved the financial report (including all statements) on the status of the Literary Fund as of September 30, 2009.

**Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Applications for Literary Fund Loans**

The Board's approval of two applications totaling \$15,000,000 was approved with the Board's vote on the consent agenda.

DIVISION	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Montgomery County	New Price's Fork Elementary	\$7,500,000.00
Buckingham County	Dillwyn Upper Elementary	7,500,000.00
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$15,000,000.00</b>

**Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Literary Fund Applications Approved for Release of Fund or Placement on a Waiting List**

The following elements were approved with the Board's vote on the consent agenda:

1. Three new projects, totaling \$19,879,954, are eligible for placement on the First Priority Waiting List.

DIVISION	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Hopewell City	Hopewell City High	\$7,500,000.00
Virginia Beach City	College Park Elementary	4,879,954.00
Montgomery County	New Price's Fork Elementary	7,500,000.00
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$19,879,954.00</b>

2. Four projects from the First Priority Waiting List participated in the Series 2009-1 Virginia Public School Authority Qualified School Construction Bond program in November and, as a result, have been removed from the First Priority Waiting List. Three other school divisions had their projects on the First Priority Waiting List reduced due to participation (partial funding) in the same bond program: Montgomery County's New Elliston-Lafayette & Shawsville Elementary School project was reduced by \$7,365,465, Richmond County's Elementary School project was reduced by \$2,231,959, and Fluvanna County's High School project was reduced by \$4,830,000.

DIVISION	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Petersburg City	Robert E. Lee Elementary	\$6,493,700.00
Portsmouth City	Simonsdale Elementary	7,500,000.00
Lynchburg City	Sandusky Middle	7,500,000.00
Lexington City	Lylburn Downing Middle	7,500,000.00

3. Henry County submitted a letter dated December 26, 2009, requesting that its Fieldale Collinsville Middle School project be removed from the First Priority Waiting List. The school board has acquired funding from sources other than the Literary Fund for this project.
4. One new project, totaling \$7,500,000, has a Literary Fund application, which is approved as to form, but the plans have not yet been finalized. When the

Department receives the plans, this project will be eligible for placement on a waiting list. Until such time, this project should remain on the Approved Application List.

**First Review of the Board of Education's 2009 Annual Report on Electronic Meetings**

The Board's approval to waive first review and adopt the *2009 Annual Report on Electronic Meetings* was approved with the Board's vote on the consent agenda.

**First Review of Revisions of Industry, Professional, or Trade Association Certification Examinations and Occupational Competency Assessments to Meet the Requirements for the Board of Education's Career and Technical Education and Advanced Mathematics and Technology Seals and the Student-Selected Verified Credit**

The Board's approval of the revised list of industry certification examinations, occupational competency assessments and licenses to meet the requirements for the Board of Education's Career and Technical Education and Advanced Mathematics and Technology Seals and the student-selected verified credit, was approved with the Board's vote on the consent agenda.

**ACTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS**

**First Review of a Request for Approval of an Innovative Program Opening Prior to Labor Day from Charlotte County Public Schools**

Mrs. Anne Wescott, assistant superintendent for policy and communications, and Mrs. Melody Hackney, superintendent of Charlotte County Public Schools, presented this item. Mrs. Wescott said that the Charlotte County School Board is requesting approval of innovative programs for Randolph Henry High School, Central Middle School, Eureka Elementary School, Bacon District Elementary School, Phenix Elementary School, and J. Murray Jeffress Elementary School. Mrs. Wescott said that Charlotte County Public Schools (CCPS) is a rural school division which includes 2,164 school-age children in grades K-12 and 100 students in PreK. Fifty-two percent of the students receive free or reduced price meals. Approximately 45 percent of the county's adults over age 25 do not have high school diplomas and only 7 percent have a baccalaureate degree or higher.

Mrs. Hackney said that because this community's culture has not historically reinforced the relevance of postsecondary education, CASHE (Connecting All Students to Higher Education) was developed and implemented last school year. The school division hopes that this program will result in 100 percent of its graduates attending postsecondary education. CCPS has a large number of students participating in dual enrollment with courses taught at the high school, online, and at the Southside Virginia Community College. During the fall of 2009, 294 students were enrolled in 28 dual enrollment classes. At each grade level from PK through grade 12 activities have been planned to expose all students to various types of higher education and career options. The CASHE program was first

implemented during the 2008-2009 school year. Four years ago less than 50 percent of this school division's graduates pursued postsecondary education. As a result of CASHE activities, this has increased to 80 percent.

Based on inclement weather, Charlotte County Public Schools has opened prior to Labor Day for the past five years. The changes in school programming due to CASHE now require that all schools in the division continue to open prior to Labor Day to ensure that the school calendar and the calendars of participating colleges comport so that students can fully participate in dual enrollment, GED (middle college), Pre-Engineering, the Governor's School of Southside Virginia, and other activities.

Mr. Johnson made a motion to waive first review and approve the request from Charlotte County Public Schools. The motion was seconded by Dr. McLaughlin and carried unanimously.

**Final Review of Proposed Amendments to Virginia's Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan Under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

Mrs. Shelley Loving-Ryder, assistant superintendent for student assessment and school improvement, and Dr. Deborah Jonas, executive director of research and strategic planning, presented this item. Mrs. Loving-Ryder said that revisions are being proposed to several critical elements in the Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan. The statutory authority that permits states to request, and the U. S. Secretary of Education to approve, waivers to requirements in NCLB is found in Section 9401 of the federal law:

“SEC. 9401. WAIVERS OF STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS.

- (a) IN GENERAL – Except as provided in subsection (c), the Secretary may waive any statutory agency, Indian tribe, or school through a local educational agency, that –
- (1) receives funds under a program authorized by this act; and
  - (2) requests a waiver under subsection (b).”

Mrs. Saslaw made a motion to adopt the proposed amendments to the Virginia Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan so that they can be submitted to USED by the January 15, 2010 deadline. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

Following are amendments to Virginia's Consolidated State Application Accountability Plan as required by the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)*:

1. Calculating Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Targets (Critical Element 3.2b)

**Request:** As allowable under Title I regulations issued November 26, 2002, annual measurable objectives can be reevaluated and adjusted periodically. Virginia will revise the annual proficiency targets (annual measurable objectives) for reading and mathematics to hold the targets at 81 percent for reading and 79 percent for mathematics for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) calculations for the 2010-2011 school year based on assessments administered in 2009-2010. However, in order to make AYP without safe harbor for the 2010-2011 school year based on assessments administered in 2009-2010, the pass rates for state,

divisions, and schools would have to exceed the 2008-2009 targets of 81 percent for reading and 79 percent for mathematics. For example, a school with a pass rate of 81.1 percent for reading would meet the target for reading while a school with a pass rate of 81 percent would not. Targets for assessments administered in 2010-2011 through 2013-2014 will be set at a later date. The chart below reflects the revised AYP targets.

**Revised NCLB AYP Targets (Annual Measurable Objectives)**

<u>Year of Test Administration</u>	<u>Reading</u>		<u>Mathematics</u>	
	<u>%Prof Current</u>	<u>%Prof Revised</u>	<u>%Prof Current</u>	<u>%Prof Revised</u>
<u>2001-02</u>	<u>60.7</u>	<u>60.7</u>	<u>58.4</u>	<u>58.4</u>
<u>2002-03</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>59</u>
<u>2003-04</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>59</u>
<u>2004-05</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>63</u>
<u>2005-06</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>67</u>
<u>2006-07</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>71</u>	<u>71</u>
<u>2007-08</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>75</u>
<u>2008-09</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>81</u>	<u>79</u>	<u>79</u>
<u>2009-10</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>81*</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>79*</u>
<u>2010-11</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>TBD</u>
<u>2011-12</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>TBD</u>
<u>2012-13</u>	<u>97</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>TBD</u>
<u>2013-14</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>TBD</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>TBD</u>

\*School divisions and the state that exceed the established target will be considered to have made AYP.

**Rationale:** Virginia recently adopted revised content standards in the area of mathematics and reading. Once new tests measuring the revised standards for reading and mathematics are implemented, in 2011-2012 for mathematics and in 2012-2013 for reading, Virginia plans to submit amendments to the accountability workbook to reflect the use of an index model to more accurately reflect student growth. Until the new tests are implemented and the necessary data to implement an index model using them are available, Virginia is proposing to hold the AYP targets at the 2008-2009 level, but only allow those schools and divisions that have made progress beyond the 2008-2009 targets to make AYP. These targets of 81 percent in reading and 79 percent in mathematics already exceed the state accreditation targets in both of these subject areas.

## 2. Assessing Students with Disabilities—Use of Two Percent Proxy (Critical Element 5.3)

**Request:** Virginia will continue to implement the United State’s Secretary of Education’s Transition Option Number 1 (2 percent proxy) for the inclusion of students with disabilities in the calculation of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) for the 2010-2011 school year, based on assessments administered to those students during the 2009-2010 school year. Option Number 1 permits states to make a mathematical adjustment to the proficiency rate for the students with disabilities subgroup in schools or divisions that failed to make AYP based solely on the scores of students in that subgroup. The proxy will be calculated in accordance with guidance disseminated by USED on May 10, 2005.

**Rationale:** In past years The U.S. Secretary of Education has allowed the use of a proxy for students with disabilities for states that are working toward developing modified achievement standards if certain eligibility conditions are met. Virginia meets the eligibility requirements as follows: 1) the statewide assessment participation rate for students with disabilities for the purpose of measuring AYP is 95 percent; 2) Virginia is in compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA); 3) appropriate accommodations on statewide assessments are available for students with disabilities; 4) targeted and successful statewide technical assistance efforts are being implemented to improve students’ achievement for students with disabilities; 5) Virginia’s assessment system has received a rating of “Approval with Recommendations”; and 6) Virginia is making substantial progress in developing an alternate assessment



based on modified achievement standards. Therefore, Virginia is requesting a continuation of the use of the proxy for certain students with disabilities under this extension.

3. Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives for Limited English proficient (LEP) Students (Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission)

**Request:** Virginia will set the Annual Measurable Achievement Objective (AMAO) for English language proficiency as 15 percent for the 2009-2010 school year. Virginia requests a waiver from setting the AMAO for progress until the state has data from two administrations of the statewide English Language Proficiency (ELP) assessment, Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State by State (ACCESS) for English Language Learners (ELLs).

**Rationale:** In September 2007, the Virginia Board of Education approved the ACCESS for ELLs as the statewide ELP assessment to meet the requirement in Section 1111(b)(7) of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB)* for implementation in the 2008-2009 school year. Prior to the 2008-2009 school year, the Stanford English Language Proficiency (SELP) assessment or a locally developed and/or selected ELP assessment were the Board-approved ELP assessments administered in the state. The change in the statewide ELP assessments has presented a need to analyze the data and set new AMAOs.

The methodology outlined in the Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER) Working Paper No. 2008-2, Issues in the Development of Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives for WIDA Consortium States, as well as the data from the 2008-2009 administration of ACCESS for ELLs, were used to set the proposed AMAO for proficiency. Working Paper No. 2008-2 recommends that states determine the starting point for the AMAO for proficiency at the 20<sup>th</sup> percentile. Although 2008-2009 is the first year of implementation of the ACCESS for ELLs, the AMAO for proficiency was set at 15 percent, or the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile, to account for 6 years of implementation of statewide ELP assessments and standards. The 15 percent target represents the number of ELLs that were reported as proficient out of the total number of ELLs for the 2008-2009 school year. The proficiency calculation will be made based on the total number of ELLs as is required by the Federal Register Notice of Final Title III Interpretations, November 17, 2008. Previously USED allowed Virginia to report the number of proficient ELL students out of the number of ELLs who were on monitor status. Students on monitor status are close to achieving English Language proficiency but their progress is being monitored for one to two years.

The United States Department of Education (USED) granted Virginia a waiver from calculating progress for the 2008-2009 school year since data were not available from two administrations of the ACCESS for ELLs. Virginia is requesting a waiver from setting the AMAO for progress for the 2009-2010 school year until data from two administrations of the ACCESS for ELLs are available. AMAO targets for future years will be proposed once data are analyzed.

Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs) for Limited English Proficient (LEP) Students Expressed as Percents		
School Year	Percent of All LEP Students Making Progress	Percent of All LEP Students Attaining English Language Proficiency
2009-2010	<u>Waiver Requested</u>	<u>15</u>
2010-2011	TBD	TBD
2011-2012	TBD	TBD
2012-2013	TBD	TBD
2013-2014	TBD	TBD

4. Adjusting the Requirements for AMAO 1, Making Progress, for LEP Students and AMAO 2, Proficiency for LEP Students, (Consolidated State Application September 1, 2003 Submission)

**Request:** Adjust the requirements for AMAO 1, making progress in learning English for LEP students, and for AMAO 2, proficiency in learning English for LEP students, to represent only the student assessment results on the ACCESS for ELLs. Prior to the release of the USED Notice of Final Title III Interpretation, November 18, 2008, Virginia was approved to allow school divisions to report LEP student progress and proficiency as measured by a body of evidence that included the state-approved English Language Proficiency (ELP) assessment results as well as other evidence. The Notice of Final Title III Interpretation requires that states allowing a body of evidence ensure that the additional measures included in the body of evidence met certain psychometric requirements.

**Rationale:** The USED Final Title III Interpretation, November 18, 2008, requires states to demonstrate that all of the assessments used to measure English language proficiency meaningfully measure student progress and proficiency in each language domain and, overall, are valid and reliable measures of student progress and proficiency in English. The ACCESS for ELLs meets the above described criteria whereas the additional measures of English language proficiency allowed through a body of evidence do not meet the above described criteria.

5. Reporting Graduation Rates, Section 1111(h) of ESEA Updated to Comply with §200.19 of Federal Regulations Issued in October 2008

**Request:** Virginia will report the federally prescribed cohort graduation rates for students who graduate in four, five, and six years in accordance with the formula prescribed in federal regulations issued on October 29, 2008. The federal graduation indicators defined in regulation are based on cohorts of students adjusted for students who transfer in, transfer out, or are deceased; the regulations do not permit states to adjust for certain students such as English language learners and students with disabilities who may require more time to graduate. Virginia will prepare reports that provide the information prescribed in the final regulations and information on the number of cohort students (for the state, school divisions, and schools, by subgroup) who: are still enrolled in school; earn alternative completion credentials; drop out; or are on long-term leave of absence.

To be consistent with the longitudinal student tracking required for the cohort graduation rate, Virginia will define LEP students based on their status from the first time they enter the cohort. Students who meet the federal definition of limited English proficiency for purposes of state, division, and school accountability at any time since first entering a federally defined cohort will be included in longitudinal cohort graduation rate reported to meet federal requirements.

Virginia will include in the federal cohort graduation rate indicator all diplomas that require a minimum number of prescribed courses that are aligned with state content standards (the Standards of Learning) and require students to participate in and pass state-approved assessments. Currently, this would exclude from the reported rate the Virginia Board of Education-approved Special Diploma, the General Achievement Diploma (GAD) and other recognized completion credentials including the General Educational Development Certificate (GED) and the locally awarded Certificate of Program Completion.

Virginia will include summer graduates in the federal graduation rate. Data for summer graduates are not available at the time of AYP determinations. As such, the data reported in any given year will be based on the previous year's graduates. Report cards will be updated when the data become available.

**Rationale:** In October 2008, the US Department of Education issued final amended regulations governing programs administered under Part A of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended. ESEA as amended requires states to report graduation rates for public secondary school students. Federal regulations as amended in October 2008 prescribe the method for calculating a cohort graduation rate. Final regulations do not permit students to have their cohort adjusted, and require that data be disaggregated by subgroups.

Beginning with the 2004-2005 school year, Virginia's statewide longitudinal data system included unique identifiers for all students who were enrolled in Virginia public schools. Using data from this system, Virginia is able to calculate a four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate consistent with those prescribed in federal regulations at the school, school division, and state level, disaggregated by subgroup, beginning with the graduating class of 2008. We propose to amend the accountability workbook to report graduation rates consistent with the adjusted cohort graduation rate prescribed in the amended regulations. The rate will include all diplomas that require a minimum number of prescribed courses that are aligned with state content standards (the Standards of Learning) and that require students to participate in and pass state-approved assessments to graduate.

We propose to amend the accountability workbook such that for purposes of reporting graduation rates, English language learners who meet the federal definition of limited English proficient (LEP) at any time since first entering the adjusted cohort will be included in the LEP student subgroup. This would include all students identified as LEP for calculating the pass rates for federal accountability, *and* students who were identified as LEP at anytime since first entering ninth grade or otherwise transferring into the adjusted cohort. Virginia's educators are committed to educating all students. Students who were identified as LEP in the early years of high school but are no longer part of the LEP subgroup when they graduate have benefitted from the instruction that our schools provide; the reporting should reflect our schools' and students' commitment and success.

Data required to calculate the federal graduation rate are not available at the time of determining adequate yearly progress and updating school report cards. Therefore, we will include the prior years' graduation rate on report cards issued in the summer, and update report cards when final data become available.

6. Annual Measurable Objectives for Graduation Rate (Critical Element 3.2b) and Targets for Continuous and Substantial Improvement (§200.19 (b)(3)(i).)

**Request:** To provide consistency for Virginia's high schools, and consistent with Section 9401 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Virginia requests waivers from certain provisions of CFR §200.19 and requests that for purposes of making AYP determinations, the Commonwealth be approved to use the Graduation and Completion Index (GCI) as adopted into state regulation by the Virginia Board of Education as the other academic indicator for schools with a graduating class. In adopting the GCI requirement as part of the regulations governing state school accreditation, the state Board required schools to earn a GCI of 85 or higher to be fully accredited. This benchmark is proposed as the statewide goal consistent with §200.19 (b)(3)(i).

Virginia proposes to establish targets for continuous and substantial improvements toward meeting the statewide goal of 85 by applying a calculation that requires schools to increase their index by a percent reduction in their non-completer rate.<sup>1</sup> The following calculations will be applied to the index to determine whether the state, school divisions, schools, and subgroups that do not meet the statewide goal of 85 have made continuous and substantial improvement:

State, division, school, or subgroup index score	Methodology for determining target for substantial and continuous improvement
$75 \leq \text{Index} < 85$	Target = $((100 - \text{last year's index}) * 0.05) + \text{last year's index}$
Index < 75	Target = $((100 - \text{last year's index}) * 0.10) + \text{last year's index}$

<sup>1</sup> The non-completer rate will be defined based on the weighted formula used to calculate the index. It will be the inverse of the index score.

For purposes of calculating AYP for the LEP subgroup, we propose to apply a definition of LEP students that is consistent with the longitudinal nature of the accountability measure. English language learners who meet the federal definition of LEP at anytime since first entering the adjusted cohort will be included in the LEP student subgroup for purposes of accountability. This would include all students identified as LEP for calculating the pass rates for federal accountability, *and* students who were identified as LEP at anytime since first entering ninth grade or otherwise transferring into the adjusted cohort. Virginia's educators are committed to educating all students. Students who were identified as LEP in the early years of high school but are no longer part of the LEP subgroup when they graduate have benefitted from the instruction that our schools provide; our accountability system should reflect their commitment and successes.

Because the complete data on student graduation and completion rates, including summer graduates, are not available until after adequate yearly progress determinations are announced each year, Virginia will calculate adequate yearly progress based on the previous year's graduation and completion index. This will permit the calculations to be available in time to make AYP determinations before the beginning of the school year.

**Rationale:**

AYP Determinations

In 2009, the Virginia Board of Education adopted a regulatory requirement that requires all schools with a graduating class to meet a minimum pass rate on end-of-course assessments *and* a minimum index score on a prescribed graduation and completion index to be fully accredited under the state's accountability system. The Board-approved GCI results in a weighted percentage of students who graduate from high school with a Board of Education-approved diploma or who earn alternative completion credentials from each high school. Under the state accountability system, all schools with a graduating class will be held accountable for meeting or exceeding a GCI of 85 beginning with the graduating class of 2011.

The GCI is calculated by following each cohort of students for four or more years, starting with the year that students first enter ninth grade or when students first transfer into the cohort. Consistent with federal regulations permitting accountability measures to include the four-year and extended graduation rates, the GCI cohort includes students who graduate in four years and students who require more time to graduate from high school. The index results in a weighted percentage based on the following points awarded according to student status:

- Graduate with a diploma – 100 points in the graduation year
- Earn a GED certificate – 75 points
- Remain in school beyond expected cohort graduation year – 70 points
- Earn a certificate of completion – 25 points

Use of the GCI offers schools incentives to continue to support students who require more than four years to graduate by giving them points for students who stay in school beyond their four-year (or "expected") graduation year, and by giving schools full credit when such students earn diplomas. This aspect of the policy is consistent with recent research showing that late graduates fare better in many aspects of life than GED earners or dropouts, including employment outcomes, involvement in civic life, and commitment to healthy lifestyles (Hull, 2009). The index also incorporates the alternative completion credentials recognized in Virginia, the GED certificate and the Certificate of Program Completion, but gives them less weight than a high school diploma—substantially less weight than the minimum index of 85 that is required for full accreditation. Including alternative credentials in an accountability system is consistent with research showing that compared to students who drop out, students who earn alternative completion credentials have better short- and long- term employment outcomes (Kienzi & Kena, 2006; Boesel, Alsalam, & Smith, 1998).

Defining the LEP subgroup as it relates to accountability for high school graduation

Virginia is proposing to include students who enter high school as English language learners but leave high school without this designation in the LEP subgroup for making AYP determinations. Currently, all of Virginia's subgroups established for federal accountability are based on the students' most recent status.

That is, students are included in the subgroup if they are identified in the group at the end of the reporting period. However, English language learners are dynamic; students move in and out of the subgroup school based on instructional need. Schools should be recognized for successfully transitioning students out of LEP status and supporting persistence to graduation. Therefore, we propose to include in the LEP subgroup all students defined as part of the status group *and* students who were identified as being LEP students at anytime since they first entered the cohort.

Virginia data will lag by one year

Because the complete data on student graduation and completion rates, including summer graduates, are not available until after AYP determinations are made, Virginia will calculate AYP based on the previous year's GCI. This will permit the calculations to be available in time to make AYP determinations before the beginning of the school year

**References**

- Boesel, D., Alsalam, N. & Smith, T.M. (1998). *Research synthesis: Educational and labor market performance of GED recipients*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- Hull, J. (2009). Better late than never? Examining late high school graduates. Center for Public Education. Retrieved May 6, 2009.
- Kienzi, G. & Kena, G. (2006). *Issue brief: Economic outcomes of high school completers and noncompleters 8 years later*. U.S. Department of Education, NCES 2007-019. Washington, D.C. National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.

**Final Review of Proposed Revised English Standards of Learning**

Ms. Tracy Robertson, English coordinator, presented this item. Ms. Robertson said that the Standards of Learning for English were developed in 1995 and revised in 2002. The *Standards of Quality* require the Board of Education to review the Standards of Learning on a regular schedule. The *English Standards of Learning* are scheduled for review to be completed in 2010. On January 15, 2009, the Board approved a plan and timeline to review these standards. The Department of Education took the following steps to produce a draft of the proposed revised *English Standards of Learning* for the Board's first review:

- Received online comments from stakeholders, including teachers, parents, and administrators;
- Met with a teacher review committee on July 14 and 15, 2009, that consisted of recommended individuals solicited from school divisions to review the public comment and consider recommendations and reports from Achieve, The College Board, ACT, as well as the National Association of Teachers of English (NCTE), the International Reading Association (IRA) Standards, the American Association of School Librarians (AASL) Standards for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Learner, and the NCTE 21<sup>st</sup> Century Skills Map;
- Solicited a postsecondary review committee comprised of English and English education faculty and met with the review committee on August 5, 2009;
- Solicited business leaders' comments; and
- Developed a draft of the proposed revised *English Standards of Learning*.

On October 22, 2009, the Virginia Board of Education accepted the proposed revised *English Standards of Learning* for first review. The Board held two public hearings on November 30, 2009, and three public hearings on December 1, 2009, to solicit comments on the proposed revised *English Standards of Learning*. The hearings were held at

Linkhorne Middle School, Lynchburg City; Fort Chiswell High School, Wythe County; James River High School, Chesterfield County; Robinson Secondary School, Fairfax County; and Princess Anne High School, Virginia Beach City. Three speakers addressed the proposed revised *English Standards of Learning*. In addition to the comments received at the public hearings, 51 comments were received online.

The proposed revised *English Standards of Learning* consists of the following elements:

#### Introduction

The *English Standards of Learning* identify academic content for essential components of the English curriculum at different grade levels for Virginia's public schools. Standards are identified for kindergarten through grade twelve. Throughout a student's academic career from kindergarten through grade twelve, specific content strands are included. The Standards of Learning for each strand progress in complexity at each grade level.

#### Organization

The goals of the *English Standards of Learning* are to teach students to read and to prepare students to participate in society as literate citizens, equipped with the ability to communicate effectively in their communities, in the workplace, and in postsecondary education. As students progress through the school years, they become active and involved listeners and develop a full command of the English language, evidenced by their use of standard English and their rich speaking and writing vocabularies. Standards for kindergarten through third grade are organized in three related strands: Oral Language, Reading, and Writing. Standards for fourth through twelfth grades are organized in four related strands: Communication: Speaking, Listening, and Media Literacy; Reading; Writing; and Research. Each grade level is preceded by an overview that describes the major concepts and skills that each student will be expected to understand and demonstrate. The standards reflect a comprehensive instructional program and document a progression of expected achievement in each of the strands. This organization of standards also reflects the gradual progression in the development of skills.

#### Standards

The *English Standards of Learning* for Virginia public schools describe the Commonwealth's expectations for student learning and achievement in grades K-12. The standards are not intended to encompass the entire curriculum for a given grade level or course or to prescribe how the content should be taught. Teachers are encouraged to go beyond the standards and select instructional strategies and assessment methods appropriate for their students.

#### Summary of the Proposed Revised *English Standards of Learning*

The major elements of the attached proposed revised *English Standards of Learning* include:

- Edits to enhance clarity, specificity, rigor, alignment of skills and content, and a reflection of the current academic research and practice;
- Emphasis on vertical alignment in grades 4-12;
- Addition of the media literacy content in the communication strand;
- Addition of the research strand beginning in grade four;
- Addition of the specific vocabulary standards in high school; and
- Addition of skills such as ethical behavior in gathering and using information, and the analysis and synthesis of information to solve problems.

Dr. Ward made a motion to accept for final review the proposed revised *English Standards of Learning*. The motion was seconded by Mr. Krupicka and carried unanimously.

### **Final Review of Proposed Revised Science Standards of Learning**

Ms. Paula Klonowski, Science coordinator, presented this item. Ms. Klonowski said that the *Standards of Learning for Science* were developed in 1995 and revised in 2003. The *Standards of Quality* require the Board of Education to review the Standards of Learning on a regular schedule. The *Science Standards of Learning* are scheduled for review to be completed in 2010. On January 15, 2009, the Board approved a plan and timeline to review these standards beginning in 2009. The Department of Education took the following steps to produce a draft of the proposed revised *Science Standards of Learning* for the Board's first review:

- Received online comments from stakeholders, including teachers, parents, and administrators;
- Met with a teacher review committee that consisted of recommended individuals solicited from school divisions on July 16 and 17, 2009, to review the public comment and consider recommendations and documents from the: 1) National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) Frameworks; 2) National Science Education Standards, Benchmarks for Science Literacy; and 3) a report on the 21st century content standards in physics, chemistry and engineering in Virginia's K-12 curriculum prepared by retired staff from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Langley Research Center and presented to Virginia's P-16 Education Council in June 2008 and to the Board of Education as part of public comment in April, May, June, and July 2009.
- Solicited a review committee comprised of faculty from science and science education departments at postsecondary institutions and representatives from state agencies and met with them on August 6, 2009, to review and discuss their comments;
- Solicited a business and industry review committee and met with them on August 17, 2009, to review and discuss their comments; and
- Developed a draft of the proposed revised *Science Standards of Learning*.

On October 22, 2009, the Virginia Board of Education accepted the proposed revised standards for first review. The Board held two public hearings on Monday, November 30, 2009, and three public hearings on Tuesday, December 1, 2009, to solicit comments on the proposed revised *Science Standards of Learning*. The public hearings were held at Fort Chiswell High School, Wythe County; Linkhorne Middle School, Lynchburg City; Robinson Secondary School, Fairfax County; Princess Anne High School, Virginia Beach City; and James River High School, Chesterfield County. There were a total of 14 speakers. In addition to comments received at the public hearings, 608 comments were received either online or as letters and faxes.

The proposed revised *Science Standards of Learning* consists of the following elements:

#### **Introduction**

The *Science Standards of Learning* for Virginia's Public Schools identify academic content for essential components of the science curriculum at different grade levels. Standards are identified for kindergarten

through grade five, for middle school, and for a core set of high school courses — Earth Science, Biology, Chemistry, and Physics. Throughout a student's science schooling from kindergarten through grade six, content strands, or topics are included. The Standards of Learning in each strand progress in complexity as they are studied at various grade levels in grades K-6, and the strands are represented indirectly throughout the high school courses.

#### Goals

The purposes of scientific investigation and discovery are to satisfy humankind's quest for knowledge and understanding, to preserve and enhance the quality of the human experience, and to develop an understanding of the interrelationship of science with technology, engineering and mathematics.

#### K-12 Safety

In implementing the *Science Standards of Learning*, teachers must be certain that students know how to follow safety guidelines, demonstrate appropriate laboratory safety techniques, and use equipment safely while working individually and in groups. Safety must be given the highest priority in implementing the K-12 instructional program for science.

#### Instructional Technology

The use of current and emerging technologies is essential to the K-12 science instructional program.

#### Investigate and Understand

Many of the standards in the *Science Standards of Learning* begin with the phrase "Students will investigate and understand." This phrase was chosen to communicate the range of rigorous science skills and knowledge levels embedded in each standard. Limiting a standard to one observable behavior, such as "describe" or "explain," would have narrowed the interpretation of what was intended to be a rich, rigorous, and inclusive content standard.

#### Application

Science provides the key to understanding the natural world. The application of science to relevant topics provides a context for students to build their knowledge and make connections across content and subject areas. This includes applications of science among technology, engineering, and mathematics, as well as within other science disciplines. Making connections among science, technology, engineering, and mathematics is especially important in today's technologically advanced world, and various strategies can be used to facilitate these applications.

#### Standards

The *Science Standards of Learning* for Virginia public schools describe the Commonwealth's expectations for student learning and achievement in grades K-12. The *Science Standards of Learning* are not intended to encompass the entire science curriculum for a given grade level or course or to prescribe how the content should be taught. Teachers are encouraged to go beyond the standards and to select instructional strategies and assessment methods appropriate for their students.

Dr. Cannaday made a motion to accept for final review the proposed revised *Science Standards of Learning*. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously.

### **First Review of State Adoption of Textbooks and Instructional Materials for K-12 History and Social Science**

Dr. Beverly Thurston, history and social science, international education, and textbook coordinator, presented this item. Dr. Thurston said that since 1995, the Department of Education has worked with state committees to review and evaluate publishers' textbook submissions primarily with respect to Standards of Learning (SOL) correlation. Following



each review, the Department of Education provides school divisions with a list of the instructional materials submitted and a profile of each submission that includes the degree of Standards of Learning correlation. On February 19, 2009, the Board of Education authorized the Department to begin the process of the K-12 history and social science textbooks and instructional materials review.

In June 2009, committees of Virginia educators received history and social science textbook samples along with *K-12 History and Social Science Standards of Learning* textbook correlations from publishers. Members of these committees conducted individual analyses of the materials prior to meeting with the full committee. In July 2009, the committees convened in Richmond to reach consensus on their reviews of the submitted materials. The consensus evaluations were shared with publishers, and publishers were given an opportunity to respond to the committees' reviews and recommendations. Requests by publishers for reconsideration were examined carefully prior to the list being submitted to the Board of Education for first review. Two textbooks by the Wright Group/McGraw-Hill, a division of the McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., were not recommended as being adequately aligned with the *History and Social Science Standards of Learning* for two courses, United States History to 1865 and United States History: 1865 to the Present. The textbooks are: *American History 1 Before 1865* and *American History 2 After 1865*.

Mr. Krupicka made a motion to accept for first review the list of textbooks and instructional materials recommended for state adoption. The motion was seconded by Dr. Ward and carried unanimously.

### **Final Review of Educational Technology Plan for Virginia: 2010-2015**

Mr. Lan Neugent, assistant superintendent for technology and career education, presented this item. Mr. Neugent said that the *Educational Technology Plan for Virginia: 2010-2015* builds on the work of previous six-year technology plans, especially in the areas of technology infrastructure, integration, and evaluation. It reflects current state and national standards relating to student, teacher, and administrator technology skills. It also incorporates recent research into the skills needed by 21st century citizens, the way the brain acquires knowledge, and capabilities of current and future technologies.

Mr. Neugent said that the introduction to the *Educational Technology Plan for Virginia: 2010-2015* provides a concise overview of the current educational environment, both for the state and the nation. The conceptual framework for this plan is briefly introduced and illustrated with an example of one educational technology project. Goals and objectives for the six-year technology plan are provided in outline form with particular strategies for implementation as well as evaluation. Recent research applicable to each of the five focus areas of the conceptual framework is summarized, and the various characteristics of the focus areas are more fully explained. Three appendices provide further detail: *Essential Elements of ICT (Information and Communications Technology) Literacy*, *Status of Technology Use in Virginia*, and *Division Plan Alignment: 2010-2015*.

Dr. Ward made a motion to approve the *Educational Technology Plan for Virginia: 2010-2015*. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried unanimously.

**First Review of a Recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) to Approve Education Programs Offered by Virginia Institutions of Higher Education as Required by the Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia (8 VAC 20-542-10 et. Seq.)**

Mrs. Patty Pitts, assistant superintendent for teacher education and licensure, presented this item. Mrs. Pitts said that the approval of the education programs at Virginia institutions of higher education included the following:

**Partnerships and Collaborations**

During the summer of 2008, each institution offering education programs in Virginia submitted to the Virginia Department of Education a report documenting partnerships and collaborations based on preK-12 school needs for each program (endorsement area) offered. The institutions of higher education reported participation in multiple partnerships and collaborations with educational, governmental, professional, business, and community entities, as well as with school divisions, nonpublic schools, parents, and preK-12 students. At its meeting on October 23, 2008, the Board of Education approved the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's recommendation to approve the accountability measurement of partnerships and collaborations based on preK-12 school needs required by the *Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia*.

**Biennial Reporting for Accountability**

A summary of the *Biennial Report for Accountability Measure 1--Candidate Progress and Performance on Prescribed Board of Education Licensure Assessments*, July 1, 2007, to June 30, 2009 was presented to the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure during meetings on September 21, 2009, and November 16, 2009. All institutions reported that education programs (endorsement areas) met at least a 70 percent passing rate on licensure assessments required for programs with at least ten program completers and program exiters. Passing rates were reported for licensure assessments, including the Virginia Communication and Literacy Assessment (VCLA), Praxis II: Specialty Area Tests, Virginia Reading Assessment (VRA) for specified endorsement areas, and the School Leadership Licensure Assessment (SLLA) for the administration and supervision endorsement. Programs with less than ten completers and exiters for an education program did not report passing scores, and these candidates' scores will be included in the next biennial report when there are at least ten completers.

Institutions also reported meeting Accountability Measures 1-6, with the exception of St. Paul's College that reported that the education programs (Elementary Education PreK-6, History and Social Science, and Mathematics) had not met Accountability Measure 6--"Evidence of employer job satisfaction with candidates completing the program."

**Program Alignment with Competencies**

The *Regulations Governing the Review and Approval of Education Programs in Virginia* require that each education program must meet requirements defined in "8VAC20-542-70. Competencies for endorsement areas." Content area specialists in the appropriate endorsement areas reviewed the matrices, course descriptions, and course syllabi submitted by the institutions of higher education for each endorsement program. After a process of review and program modifications when required, the specialists verified program alignment with the competencies, including supervised classroom instruction, set forth in the regulations.

Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's Recommendation

On November 16, 2009, the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure received a report regarding the status of the education program matrices reviews. The Advisory Board unanimously passed a recommendation to be forwarded to the Board of Education that the Virginia education programs (endorsement areas) submitted for review be granted the "Approved" status with the exception of Saint Paul's College's education programs in Elementary Education PreK-6, History and Social Science, and Mathematics that are recommended to be granted "Approved with Stipulations." [Saint Paul's College met all criteria for education programs (endorsement areas) with the exception of these programs where they reported that Accountability Measure 6--"Evidence of employer job satisfaction with candidates completing the program" was not met].

The Board voted on the education programs (endorsement areas) offered by Virginia institutions of higher education separately.

College of William and Mary

Dr. McLaughlin stated that "by virtue of my employment at the College of William and Mary, I have a personal interest in this matter. Therefore I will not vote on this matter before the Board, and I will not participate in any discussion on it."

Dr. Ward made a motion to approve the programs at the College of William and Mary. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Saslaw and approved with "yes" votes from the following Board members: Dr. Cannaday, Dr. Emblidge, Mrs. Castro, Mrs. Saslaw, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Krupicka.

University of Virginia

Dr. Cannaday stated that "by virtue of my employment at the University of Virginia, I have a personal interest in this matter. Therefore I will not vote on this matter before the Board, and I will not participate in any discussion on it."

Dr. Ward made a motion to approve the programs at the University of Virginia. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and approved with "yes" votes from the following Board members: Dr. McLaughlin, Dr. Emblidge, Mrs. Castro, Mrs. Saslaw, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Krupicka.

Other Programs

Dr. Ward made a motion to approve all other programs as presented except "Approved with Stipulations" for the Elementary Education pre-6, History and Social Science, and Mathematics" programs at Saint Paul's College. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Saslaw and carried unanimously.

**Final Review of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's Recommended Passing Score for the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA)**

Mrs. Patty Pitts also presented this item. Mrs. Pitts said that a Virginia standard setting study was conducted on March 24 and 25, 2009, for the revised *SLLA*. The Educational Testing Service (ETS) conducted the standard setting study on behalf of the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) for the *SLLA*, which will be administered in Virginia for the first time in January 2010.

The revised assessment is designed to measure whether entry-level school leaders have the knowledge believed necessary for competent professional practice. The content of the assessment was defined by a National Advisory Committee of expert practitioners and preparation faculty and confirmed by a national survey of the field. The content of the revised assessment is aligned with the *Educational Leadership Policy Standards: ISSLC 2008*.

The four-hour assessment is divided into two separately timed sections:

- Section I (2 hours 20 minutes) – 100 multiple choice questions (80 operational and 20 pre-test); and
- Section II (1 hour 40 minutes) – Seven constructed-response questions calling for written answers based on scenarios and sets of documents that an education leader might encounter. Candidates are required to analyze situations and data, to propose appropriate courses of action, and to provide rationales for their proposal.

Prospective school leaders will be required to pay a fee for test administration and reporting results to the Virginia Department of Education. The cost for the assessment has been reduced from \$480 to \$375, including a \$50 nonrefundable registration fee.

During the Virginia standard setting study the panel recommended a cut score of 67.24. The next highest whole number is 68 and is considered the functional recommended cut score. The value of 68 represents approximately 60 percent of the total available 114 raw points that could be earned on the *SLLA*. The scaled score associated with 68 raw points is 154.

The Standard Error of Measurement for the recommended cut scores for the Virginia Standard Setting Study and the multistate studies are shown below. [Note: Consistent with the recommended cut score, the cut scores at the different SEMs have been rounded to the next highest whole number.]

**Cut Scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score – Virginia Study**

Recommended Cut Score	68	Scale Score Equivalent	154
-2 SEMs	58		143
-1 SEM	63		149
+1SEM	74		161
+2 SEMs	79		167

**Cut Scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score – Multistate Study**

**(Panel I)**

Recommended Cut Score	75	Scale Score Equivalent	162
-2 SEMs	65		151
-1 SEM	70		156
+1SEM	81		169
+2 SEMs	86		175

**Cut Scores within 1 and 2 SEMs of the Recommended Cut Score – Multistate Study**

**(Panel II)**

Recommended Cut Score	77	Scale Score Equivalent	164
-2 SEMs	68		154
-1 SEM	73		160
+1SEM	82		170
+2 SEMs	87		176

The Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure (ABTEL) reviewed the studies and cut scores established by other states at its September 21, 2009, meeting. The members decided to delay making a recommendation for a cut score until the November 16, 2009, ABTEL meeting in order to review candidates' scores from the first national administration of the *SLLA*. On November 16, the Advisory Board recommended a cut score of 161 for the *School Leaders Licensure Assessment* which is one Standard Error of Measurement above the Virginia panel's recommended score. The recommendation was made with the caveat that the passing rates for the *SLLA* be reviewed after three test administrations of the test in Virginia. The Board of Education has the authority to set the final cut score for the revised *SLLA* assessment.

Dr. Ward made a motion to amend the recommendation of the Advisory Board on Teacher Education and Licensure's cut score of 161 for *SLLA* and approve a cut score of 163. Dr. Ward stated that explicit in her motion was the understanding that the passing score will be reviewed after three test administrations. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously.

**Progress Report on Analyses Aimed at Understanding College Readiness in Virginia**

Dr. Deborah Jonas, executive director for research and strategic planning, presented this item. Dr. Jonas said that in January 2007, the Virginia Board of Education authorized the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) to conduct studies to identify key indicators of college readiness that may be used to develop measures that identify students as likely prepared for postsecondary educational programs. Since that time, the Department has been engaged in several analytic efforts related to understanding indicators that suggest students are academically prepared for postsecondary educational success when they leave high school. The primary goal of the studies listed below is to understand the relations between achievement as measured state end-of-course assessments (SOL tests) and postsecondary success:

1. Analysis of the relation between SOL scores and Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores.

2. Analysis of the relation between SOL scores and postsecondary enrollment and persistence.
3. Analysis of the relation between SOL scores and postsecondary academic outcomes, including participation on postsecondary developmental coursework and course grades in postsecondary educational programs.

Following is a summary of the progress of the analyses conducted so far, including results where applicable. VDOE has briefly described the barriers encountered that have slowed the state's forward progress in this analytic work, new approaches being used to overcome barriers and get the much needed work done, and additional work the education agencies plan to conduct in the future.

#### Analysis of the relationship between SOL scores and Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores

The Virginia Department of Education, with technical assistance from the Regional Educational Laboratory Appalachia (REL-A), conducted statistical analyses designed to understand the associations between SOL outcomes and outcomes on the SAT. VDOE acquired student-level SAT scores from the College Board, matched the data to state SOL assessment results, and considered various relations between the two. Primary results showed:

- Correlations between the mathematics SAT and SOL mathematics assessments are moderate to high, 0.54, 0.59, 0.69 for Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry, respectively, for the graduating class of 2006.
- Correlations between SAT verbal and SOL reading and writing end-of-course assessments were moderate, 0.48 and 0.45, respectively, with similar correlations between SAT writing and SOL reading and writing end-of-course assessments.

The College Board has established the following college-ready benchmarks on the SAT:<sup>2</sup>

- Low-benchmark describes students who have a 65 percent chance of earning a 2.0 grade point average (GPA) in their first year of college.
- High-benchmark describes students who have a 65 percent chance of earning a 2.7 GPA in their first year of college.

Using this information, VDOE assessed the association between scoring at or above the college-ready benchmarks and performance on the English and mathematics SOL end-of-course assessments. Results showed that nearly all students who scored at the advanced proficient level on the SOL assessments in mathematics, reading and writing met or exceeded the College Board's low-benchmark on the SAT, and between 40 and 50 percent of students who scored advanced proficient on the SOL tests scored at or above the College Board's high benchmark on the SAT. Few students (10 percent or less) who scored at the proficient level on the SOL met the high benchmark on the SAT. Taken together, the results suggest that performance on the SOL test and the SAT are related, and that advanced proficiency in particular is associated with the College Board's definition of college ready.

#### Analysis of the associations between SOL scores and postsecondary enrollment and persistence

VDOE contracted with researchers at Virginia Tech to study the association between SOL performance and postsecondary enrollment as documented by data acquired from the National Student Clearinghouse (NSC). The NSC data document students' enrollment in and completion of programs in postsecondary institutions across the country; the NSC enrollment data include 92 percent of students enrolled in postsecondary institutions in the United States. The data are limited in that they do not provide any information on students' course-taking patterns or course outcomes (i.e., grades).

---

2 Kobrin, J. L. (2007). Determining SAT benchmarks for college readiness. (College Research Note No. RN-30). New York, NY: College Board.

Phase I focused on the association between SOL scores and postsecondary enrollment in two-year and four-year institutions. As well, researchers considered how postsecondary enrollment varies by student groups or other variables available from VDOE, such as diploma type. Phase II, which remains ongoing, is focused on understanding how SOL scores relate to students' successful persistence into their second year of postsecondary education.

While the results of enrollment in two-year institutions are interesting, the meaning of these outcomes is unclear because such a large percentage of students who enroll in two-year schools participate in developmental (remedial) coursework—approximately 45 percent of students enrolled in Virginia's two-year postsecondary colleges require developmental education in English or mathematics each year. In comparison, approximately three percent of students enrolled in Virginia's four-year institutions require developmental education. Therefore, without the ability to connect enrollment to student outcomes, the findings presented here are limited to those from students who enrolled in four-year institutions.

Key findings available thus far from the students who graduated or completed high school in 2007 show:

- Forty-one and a half (41.5) percent of students in the graduating class of 2007 enrolled in four-year postsecondary institutions within two years of completing high school.
- Seventy (70) percent of students who earn advanced studies diplomas enroll in four-year postsecondary institutions, whereas only 16 percent of students who earn standard diplomas attend four-year postsecondary institutions.
- Students who completed Virginia's Early College Scholars agreements and earned Early College Scholars certificates were more likely to enroll in four-year schools within two years of graduating high school, 85 percent and 89 percent, respectively.
- Sixty (60) percent of students who were dually-enrolled in secondary and postsecondary institutions in high school enrolled in four-year postsecondary institutions within two years of graduating from high school.
- Students who graduated high school in 2007 and earned advanced proficiency on the Algebra II SOL assessment had a 79 percent probability of enrolling in four-year institutions.
- Students who scored advanced proficient on the reading SOL had a 64 percent chance of enrolling in four-year institutions and students who scored advanced proficient on the writing assessment had a 72 percent chance of enrolling in four-year institutions.
- Students who scored at the proficient level on end-of-course assessments except Algebra II and chemistry assessments had at most a 45 percent probability of enrolling in four-year institutions; students who earned proficient scores on the Algebra II and chemistry assessments had a 50 and 59 percent probability of enrolling in four-year institutions.

Analyses of the association between SOL assessments and persistence in postsecondary educational programs are still in progress. Initial work to understand how persistence relates to postsecondary enrollment shows that:

- Of students who enroll in four-year institutions across the country (as measured with data from the National Student Clearinghouse), nearly 87 percent persist into their second year.
- Once students enroll in four-year postsecondary schools, SOL scores from high school are not meaningful factors to distinguish between the students who persist into their second year and students who leave—other factors must be investigated to understand the factors that lead students out of four-year institutions.
- For the high school graduating class of 2006, approximately 20 percent were enrolled in two-year institutions within one-year of graduating from high school.
  - a. Nineteen (19) percent of students who enrolled in two-year postsecondary institutions within one-year of completing high school transferred to a four-year institution within three years of graduating high school.
  - b. Approximately 24 percent of the students who enrolled in two-year postsecondary institutions within one year of completing high school had either earned a credential *or* transferred to four-year institutions before the end of academic year 2008-2009. Students

with higher scaled scores on the SOL tests were more likely to transfer to a four-year school *or* earn a credential.

The association between SOL scores and postsecondary academic outcomes

The completed analyses on SAT and postsecondary enrollment, coupled with results from national studies, suggest that students who meet one or more of the following criteria are likely to be successful in postsecondary work at four year institutions:

1. Students who earn an advanced studies diploma in Virginia;
2. Students who participate in Virginia's Early College Scholars program;
3. Students who take Algebra II and chemistry in high school and earn advanced proficient or close to advanced proficient scores on these and the SOL end-of-course reading and writing assessments, and
4. Students who score at or above college-ready benchmarks established on the SAT and ACT.<sup>®</sup>

There may be other indicators of successful preparation for postsecondary education in Virginia. Without access to data that directly link high school student achievement data to postsecondary course enrollment, Virginia has limited information about how other outcomes are associated with postsecondary success. In particular, data linked between VDOE and SCHEV are critical to understanding the associations between high school achievement and success in two-year institutions. For example, is there an analytically derived profile or set of SOL scores and high school course taking patterns that are associated with student success in postsecondary? Can SOL assessment scores reliably predict students' preparation for college-level coursework, eliminating the need for placement tests for students who attend community colleges?

To answer these and other questions, VDOE and SCHEV have been working together for several years to determine how data from the agencies can be merged for analytic purposes. This work required VDOE and SCHEV to work through the technical (i.e., data-related) issues that would permit the data to be linked. As well, the agencies worked together to develop a methodology that permits de-identified data to be reliably merged at the student level. That is, the merge methodology removed all information from the dataset that could identify individuals, including names, social security numbers, and dates of birth. This methodology, coupled with language in the state Appropriation Act, are considered sufficient to meet the requirements of federal and state privacy laws to permit the separate agencies to merge the data.

The agencies are in the process of merging and analyzing the data. However, there are significant limitations regarding the first available data sets for merging. The first data sets for which there are sufficient variables that are available for linking between the two agencies are limited to students who have participated in SAT testing. This excludes the vast majority of students who enroll in two-year programs and who are more likely to participate in developmental education. This data sample is, however, likely to provide a representative sample of students who enroll in four-year institutions. Therefore, the results of the first analysis are expected to provide further validation of the results from the analyses of SAT and postsecondary enrollment analyses described above, but are not expected to be useful for understanding other issues, particularly those related to developmental education.

More comprehensive data with sufficient variables for linking between VDOE and SCHEV will be available for merge in spring 2010. The timeline below describes the agencies' time frame for completing analyses on the initial, limited data set and the more comprehensive data set that will become available in the future.

- January 2010:
  - Complete descriptive analyses to validate the initial, limited data set merged between VDOE and SCHEV.
  - Determine the representativeness of the initial, limited data set available for analysis.
- February 2010, using the initial, limited data set:
  - Develop programming requirements to conduct inferential analyses that describe the association between high school achievement as measured by participation in and outcomes on SOL assessments;



- Develop preliminary profile of high school indicators, including SOL assessment outcomes, that are associated with student enrollment and success in the first year of postsecondary education;
  - Based on the representativeness of the sample, describe the limitations of the study results.
- Spring 2010:
  - SCHEV will complete data collection that permits a more comprehensive set of data to be linked to VDOE's data.
  - Third party to merge the de-identified data from SCHEV and VDOE for analytic use.
- May-June 2010:
  - Conduct inferential analyses to analyze the association between high school achievement indicators (SOL participation and outcomes) and postsecondary outcomes in Virginia.
  - Develop profile of high school indicators including SOL assessment outcomes that describe the outcomes of students who have a high probability of being successful in postsecondary education.
  - Develop qualitative descriptions of student achievement that are consistent with the high school indicators of postsecondary readiness.
- June-July 2010:
  - Present recommendations to the Virginia Board of Education and other relevant stakeholders on high school indicators of postsecondary success.
  - Present plan to conduct ongoing validation studies and updates to the SOL profile and factors associated with postsecondary readiness.

Dr. McLaughlin made a motion to accept the report for informational purposes. The motion was seconded by Dr. Cannaday and carried unanimously.

### ***DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES***

#### **Dinner Session**

The Board met for dinner at the Crowne Plaza Hotel with the following members present: Dr. Emblidge, Dr. Cannaday, Mrs. Castro, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Krupicka, Mrs. McLaughlin, Mrs. Saslaw and Dr. Ward. A brief discussion took place about general Board business. No votes were taken, and the dinner meeting ended at 8:30 p.m.

### ***EXECUTIVE SESSION***

Mr. Johnson made a motion to go into executive session under Virginia Code Section 2.2-3711.A.41, specifically to discuss personnel matters involving identifiable employees and prospective employees. The motion was seconded by Dr. McLaughlin and carried unanimously. The Board went into executive session at 11:20 a.m.

Mr. Johnson made a motion that the Board reconvene in open session. The motion was seconded by Dr. McLaughlin and carried unanimously. The Board reconvened at 11:35 a.m.

Mr. Johnson made a motion that the Board certify by roll-call vote that to the best of each member's knowledge, (1) only public business matters lawfully exempted from open meeting requirements by Virginia law were discussed in the executive session to which this

certification motion applies, and (2) only such public business matters as were considered by the Board. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Castro and carried unanimously.

Board Roll call:

Dr. Cannaday – Yes	Mrs. Saslaw – Yes
Dr. Ward – Yes	Mr. Johnson – Yes
Mrs. Castro – Yes	Mr. Krupicka – Yes

The following motions were made:


Case 1: The Board of Education approved the issuance of a Provisional (Special Education License).

Case 2: The Board of Education approved the issuance of a license (State of Eligibility).

Case 3: The Board of Education approved the renewal of a teaching license.

### ***ADJOURNMENT***

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Career and Technical Education, Dr. Ward adjourned the meeting at 11:40 a.m.



---

President